

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 9. In this regard, Applicant notes that while page 4 of the Office Action indicates that there is no support for the recitation "an ultraviolet curable hard coat agent of (meth) acrylates, urethane (meth) acrylates or polyester (meth) acrylates", page 4 of the Office Action indicates that (i) there is support to recite "wherein the hard coat layer comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a thermosetting hard coat agent of silicone hard coat agent" and (ii) the specification (e.g., see paragraph [0035] in publication of the present application and claim 9) only provides support to recite an ultraviolet hard coat agent of a polyfunctional ultraviolet curable acrylic compound having three or more functional groups and being selected from the group consisting of acrylates, urethane acrylates and polyester acrylates.

Claim 5 has been amended to facilitate rejoinder pursuant to the provisions of MPEP 821.04(b).

Claim 9 has been canceled in view of the amendment of claim 1.

Claim 10 has been amended to make a change suggested by the Examiner in a telephone interview conducted February 25, 2011.

Claim 11 has been added based on the disclosure in paragraph [0035] in the publication of the present application, which discloses:

oligomer, resin or compositions thereof which is ultraviolet curable hard coat agent which can be cured by irradiation of ultraviolet ray. The examples include polyfunctional ultraviolet curable acrylic compounds having three or more functional groups such as acrylates, urethane acrylates and polyester acrylates. Preferable examples include trimethylol ethane tri(meth)acrylate, trimethylol propane tri(meth)acrylate, pentaerythritol tri (meth)acrylate, pentaerythritol

tetra(meth)acrylate, dipentaerythritol penta(meth)acrylate, dipentaerythritol hexa(meth)acrylate, glycerol tri(meth)acrylate and triallyl(meth)acrylate. ... (emphasis added).

Entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview with Examiner

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted with Applicant's representative on February 25, 2011. Applicant believes that the interview has materially advanced the prosecution of the present application. A Statement of Substance of Interview is being submitted herewith.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

On page 3 of the Office Action, in paragraph 5, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner's Position

The Examiner's position appears to be basically that claim 1 recites "wherein the hard coat layer comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a thermosetting hard coat agent of silicone hard coat agent and an ultraviolet curable hard coat agent of (meth) acrylates, urethane (meth) acrylates or polyester (meth) acrylates", but while there is support to recite that "wherein the hard coat layer comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a thermosetting hard coat agent of silicone hard coat agent", the Examiner considers that there is no support to broadly recite "an ultraviolet curable hard coat agent of (meth) acrylates, urethane (meth) acrylates or polyester (meth) acrylates". Rather, the Examiner indicates that the

specification (e.g., see paragraph [0035] in publication of the present application and claim 9) only provides support to recite an ultraviolet hard coat agent of a polyfunctional ultraviolet curable acrylic compound having three or more functional groups and being selected from the group consisting of acrylates, urethane acrylates and polyester acrylates. As such, the Examiner considers that claim 1 is broader in scope than what is supported by the specification.

Applicant's Response

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate recitations of claim 9, and claim 9 has been canceled accordingly. In this regard, Applicant notes that as discussed above, page 4 of the Office Action indicates that (i) there is support to recite "wherein the hard coat layer comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a thermosetting hard coat agent of silicone hard coat agent" and (ii) the specification (e.g., see paragraph [0035] in publication of the present application and claim 9) only provides support to recite an ultraviolet hard coat agent of a polyfunctional ultraviolet curable acrylic compound having three or more functional groups and being selected from the group consisting of acrylates, urethane acrylates and polyester acrylates. In view of this indication of support in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 1 accordingly.

Thus, Applicant submits that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

On page 4 of the Office Action, in paragraph 7, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner's Position

The Examiner's position is basically that claim 9, which recites specific hard coat agents, depends from amended claim 1, which also recites specific hard coat agents, so it is unclear whether the hard coat agents recited in claim 9 are additional hard coat agents.

Applicant's Response

In response, Applicant has canceled claim 9, so there is no longer any issue as to whether the hard coat agents recited in claim 9 are additional hard coat agents beyond those recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowance of Claim 10

On page 5 of the Office action, in paragraph 9, the Examiner indicates that claim 10 is allowed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 10 is allowed. Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the other claims should be allowed as well, and thus allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 9, 2011